

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Imputed Negligence.—In Union Traction Co. of Indiana v. Grant, 135 N. E. Rep. 486, the Supreme Court of Indiana held that to impute the negligence of one person to another, the relation between them must be one invoking the principles of agency, or the parties must be co-operating in a joint or common enterprise, or the relation between the parties must have been such that the person to whom the negligence is imputed must have had a legal right to control the action of the person actually negligent; that the negligence of the driver of a wagon furnished by the township trustees to transport children to school, under a statute requiring the trustees to furnish a wagon, resulting in the death of a child, could not be imputed to the parent, who, while having the right to avail himself of the agency, had no right to control or regulate it.

The court said:

"The driver of the conveyance was employed under authority of law by the school township, acting through the school trustee. To be sure, the plaintiff had the legal right to avail himself of this agency, but he had the right neither to employ, discharge, to enlarge or limit the scope of such employment, nor regulate the route or time schedule of such driver. To impute the negligence of one person to another, the relation between them must be one invoking the principles of agency, or the parties must be co-operating in a common or joint enterprise, or the relation between the parties must have been such that the persons to whom the negligence is imputed must have had a legal right to control the action of the person actually negligent. 1 Shearman & Redfield, Law of Negligence (6th Ed.) § 65a, et seq. None of the elements of the relation of master and servant exist between the plaintiff and the driver. The question of agency, therefore, may well be denied, under the rule relating to passengers in omnibuses concerning imputed negligence. To hold the negligence of the driver imputable to plaintiff because of their combined occupation in a common or joint enterprise, it would be necessary to hold that the plaintiff had an equal right to direct and govern the movements and conduct of the driver in respect to such negligent acts. And, in so far as the relationship between the plaintiff and such driver is concerned in this case, it must be held that the plaintiff had no legal right to control the actions of the driver in the operation of his movements. So that, in so far as the negligence of the driver of the conveyance is concerned in this case, it is not to be considered as limiting the legal right of plaintiff to damages, based upon proof of every essential element necessary thereto, committed by the defendant. Thus it has been held that the negligence of the driver of a vehicle in which he is riding, is imputed to the guest where both are engaged in a joint enterprise in which the transportation is a factor; that to establish a joint enterprise the passenger must have either express or implied right to direct the movements of the vehicle used. Robison v. Oregon-Washington R. & Nav. Co. (1918) 90 Or. 490, 176 Pac. 594."